REMARKS

At the time of the Fourth Office Action dated February 24, 2006, claims 1-10 were pending and rejected in this application. Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claims 1 and 6 do not generate any new matter issue.

CLAIMS 1-2, 5-7, AND 10 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON UPTON ET AL., U.S. PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2003/0105884 (HEREINAFTER UPTON), IN VIEW OF JEFFRIES ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 6,094,529 (HEREINAFTER JEFFRIES), AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF HOMER ET AL., "INSTANT HTML," COPYRIGHT 1997, PAGES 88-101 (HEREINAFTER HOMER)

On page 3 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner identified column 5, paragraph 62 of Upton as identically disclosing the previously claimed "selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected error text in said row." Applicants note, however, that independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the limitations recited therein, and support for these limitations is found throughout Applicants' originally-filed disclosure, for example, in lines 14-19 on page 11. Specifically, claims 1 and 6, in part, now recite:

> generating an error code specific to the error type of the validation error;
> comparing the error code to an index of a plurality of error codes, the index including a corresponding error text, respectively, for each of the plurality of error codes;
> selecting said error text corresponding to said error code;
> inserting said selected error text in said row.

Upton, however, fails to teach these limitations. Specifically, lines 10-19 of paragraph [0062] of Upton states:

> For each value submitted, the value can be validated against a set of constraints. If any field values are invalid, the form can be redisplayed to the user with an error message next to each erroneous field on the form. The error message can be localized for the user's preferred locale if the web application supports multiple locales. In addition, the user's last input can be redisplayed so the user does not have to re-input any valid information. The web application can loop as many times as needed until all fields submitted are valid.

Comparing Upton to the above-reproduced claimed limitations, Upton does not teach generating an error code. Moreover, whereas Upton teaches having an error message based upon "the user's preferred locale if the web application supports multiple locales," the claimed invention is directed to selecting the error message based upon an error code, which is based upon the error type of the validation error. Thus, a rejection of the claims based upon the teachings of Upton, Jeffries, and Homer would not be proper.

Therefore, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to modify the '901 provisional application (i.e., Upton) in view of Jeffries and Homer, the claimed invention would not result. Thus, Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejections of claims 1-2, 5-7, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Upton in view of Jeffries and Homer.

CLAIMS 3-4 AND 8-9 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON UPTON IN VIEW OF JEFFRIES AND HOMER AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF HARTMANN, U.S. PATENT NO. 6,615,226

The additional reference to Hartmann does not cure the deficiencies of the prior rejection, and thus Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 3-4 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Upton in view of Jeffries, Homer, and Hartmann.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

> When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction. (emphasis added)

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: October 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
Phone: (561) 922-3845
CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320